

**PATENT****REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated 1/11/2006 is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.111(b).

In response to the Final Office Action dated 1/11/2006, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the holding of finality and requests continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant also requests that the application be reconsidered in light of the remarks herein in accordance with 37 CFR 1.111.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-14, 17-18, and 30 are pending.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-14, 17-18, and 30 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 14 and 17 have been amended.

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 17 are amended. Claim 1 was amended to include the limitation of a lens apparatus that produces a composite image of the document and image information decoded from the encoded information wherein the orientation of the image information is determined by disambiguation. Support for this limitation is found at least in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 and associated description in paragraphs [041]-[044]; and paragraphs [049]-[053], and [055]. Independent claims 5, 9, and 17 were similarly amended. Claims 13 and 14 were amended to be consistent with currently amended claim 9.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for providing clear, specific and well reasoned rejections in this office action.

***I. Approval of Drawings Submitted April 2002***

The Examiner has approved the informal drawings that were submitted on with the application as filed. A set of formal drawings were submitted with the Reply to the Notice of Missing Parts and received by the PTO on April 8, 2002. Applicant again requests the Examiner to approve the formal drawings received at the PTO on April 8, 2002.

**PATENT*****II. Amendments to the Specification***

There were at least two substantially similar patent applications filed on December 6, 1999. One was Application No. 09/454,526, entitled METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DISPLAY OF SPATIALLY REGISTERED INFORMATION USING EMBEDDED DATA and the other was Application No. 09/455,304, entitled METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DECODING ANGULAR ORIENTATION OF LATTICE CODES. The serial numbers and titles of these two applications apparently were switched during preparation of the patent application. However, these applications disclose the same subject matter and thus, no new matter has been added to this application by the amendment to the specification.

***III. Rejections under 35 USC §103 (Wang + Shioda)***

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-11, 17-18, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 5,490,217) and further in view of Shioda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,634,559).

A prima facie case of obviousness is established by one or more references that were available to the inventor and that teach a suggestion to combine or modify the reference, the combination or modification of which would appear to be sufficient to have made the claimed invention obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, and 17 to include limitations directed towards a lens apparatus that produces a composite image of the document and image information decoded from the encoded information.

Currently amended claim 5 is illustrative of these limitations and is:

A method for creating a tamper-proof document, comprising:  
digitally encoding a user-inputted portion of the document as encoded information;  
selecting a location on the tamper-proof document to place the encoded information;  
selecting a level of access for the encoded information;  
processing, responsive to selecting the level of access, the encoded information; and

**PATENT**

printing the tamper-proof document including the encoded information as an area of glyph marks at the location; and displaying a composite image of the document and image information decoded from the encoded information wherein the orientation of the image information is determined by disambiguation.

While Wang mentions real time verification at column 5, line 58 to column 6, line 8, nothing in Wang teaches how to do the verification. The instant application displays a composite image of the document and appropriately oriented image information that is decoded from the encoded information on the document. Support for this limitation is found at least in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 and associated description in paragraphs [041]-[044]; and paragraphs [049]-[053], and [055].

Nothing in Wang teaches or suggests displaying such a composite image.

Shioda teaches using a data sheet that contains encoded information of a document file; it also teaches printing such a data sheet and scanning a data sheet. The data sheet can include passwords and passcodes. However, nothing in Shioda teaches or suggests displaying a composite image of the document and image information that is decoded from the encoded information on the document.

Nothing in the combination of Wang and Shioda teaches or suggests displaying such a composite image. Thus, **currently amended claim 5** is patentable. For similar reasons **currently amended claims 1, 9, and 17** are also patentable over Wang and Shioda.

Previously presented **claims 2, 6, 8, 12, and 30** as well as original **claims 10, 11, and 18** as well as **currently amended claims 13 and 14**, directly or indirectly depend on and further limit their respective independent claims that are patentable. Thus, these claims are also patentable.

Furthermore, even adding the teachings of Mayer to Wang and Shioda does not teach or suggest **currently amended claims 1, 5, 9 or 17**. Mayer teaches a lens array that allows comparison of an optically decrypted image of an optically encrypted image of a signature with the drawer's signature. Mayer requires that the document with the

**PATENT**

optically encrypted signature and the drawer's signature are exactly positioned under the lens and with the correct orientation. Nothing in Mayer teaches or suggests a lens apparatus configured to produce a composite image of the document and image information decoded from the encoded information wherein the orientation of the image information is determined by disambiguation.

***IV. Rejections under 35 USC §103 (Wang + Shioda+Mayer)***

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. Patent 5,490,217) and Shioda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,634,559), and further in view of Mayer, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 4,202,626).

A prima facie case of obviousness is established by one or more references that were available to the inventor and that teach a suggestion to combine or modify the reference, the combination or modification of which would appear to be sufficient to have made the claimed invention obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

As previously discussed, Wang in view of Shioda does not teach or suggest displaying the decoded information as a composite image of the document and the decoded information wherein the orientation of the decoded information is determined by disambiguation. Support for this limitation is found at least in Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 and associated description in paragraphs [041]-[044]; and paragraphs [049]-[053], and [055].

Furthermore, even adding the teachings of Mayer to Wang and Shioda does not teach or suggest currently amended claim 9. Mayer teaches a lens array that allows comparison of an optically decrypted image of an optically encrypted image of a signature with the drawer's signature. Mayer requires that the document with the optically encrypted signature and the drawer's signature are exactly positioned under the lens and with the correct orientation.

Nothing in Mayer teaches or suggests a lens apparatus configured to produce a composite image of the document and image information decoded from the encoded information wherein the orientation of the image information is determined by

**PATENT**

disambiguation. Thus, currently amended claim 9 is patentable over the combination of Wang, Shioda and Mayer.

Previously presented claim 12 and original claims 13 and 14 depend on and further limit claim 9 that is patentable, thus previously presented claim 12 and currently amended claims 13 and 14 are patentable over Wang in view of Shioda in view of Mayer.

Since all rejections, objections and requirements contained in the outstanding official action have been fully answered or traversed and shown to be inapplicable to the present claims, it is respectfully submitted that reconsideration is now in order under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.111(b) and such reconsideration is respectfully requested. Upon reconsideration, it is also respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is therefore respectfully requested.

The undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Should any additional issues remain, or if I can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 812-4259.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel B. Curtis #39159/

DANIEL B. CURTIS  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 39,159  
(650) 812-4259  
dbcurtis@parc.com